

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of November 30, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-16, and 19-22 remain in the application.

Claim 1 stands objected to due to an alleged failure of the specification to support an “always on device” as claimed. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested as the phrase “always on device” does not even appear in Applicants’ claim 1. The Action appears to intend to object to Applicants’ dependent claim 5. Without acquiescing to the objection, Applicants have amended claims 5 and 9 to place the claims in a more preferred form. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Without acquiescing to the rejections, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to place the claims in a more preferred form. As such, the present rejections are moot.

Claims 1-2, 6, 12-15, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. App. No. 2001/0027527 to Khidekel *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “*Khidekel*”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,717,756 to Coleman (hereinafter referred to as “*Coleman*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* teach or suggest each of the features as described in the Action, the Action is silent on the following recitation in claim 1: “wherein said data is rendered by said server.” *Khidekel* describes a server (12), which is used for authentication and another server (36), which contains the data information. However, *Khidekel* is silent with respect to a server rendering data. In contrast, Applicants’ claim 1 recites, among other features, “said data is rendered by said server.” *Coleman* fails to cure this deficiency of *Khidekel*. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested at least with respect to the lack of each and every feature being taught or suggested in the combination of references.

Independent claims 6, 13, and 19 include similar features as described above with respect to Applicant's independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least similar reasons as described above with respect to claim 1, Applicant's claims 6, 13, and 19 are patentably distinct from the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman*.

Claims 2, 12, 14-15, and 20, which depend from claims 1, 6, 13, and 19, respectively, are patentably distinct over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. No. 2003/0208598 to *Athey, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "*Athey*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Athey* is proper, *Athey* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* described above with respect to claims 1 and 6 from which claims 3 and 7, respectively, depend. Therefore, claims 3 and 7 are patentably distinct from the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Athey*.

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. No. 2002/0188854 to *Heaven, et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "*Heaven*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Heaven* is proper, *Heaven* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* described above with respect to Applicants' claim 1 from which claims 21-22 depend. Therefore, claims 21-22 are patentably distinct from the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Heaven*.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. No. 2003/0088771 to *Merchen* (hereinafter referred to as "*Merchen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Merchen* is proper, *Merchen* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* described

above with respect to claim 6 from which claim 11 depends. Therefore, Applicants' claim 11 is patentably distinct from the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Merchen*.

Claims 4-5, 9, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120 to Larsen, *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "*Larsen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman*, and *Larsen* is proper, *Larsen* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Khidekel* and *Coleman* described above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 13 from which claims 4-5, 9, and 16, respectively, depend. Therefore, claims 4-5, 9, and 16 are patentably distinct from the combination of *Khidekel*, *Coleman* and *Larsen*.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3155.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: February 21, 2007

By: /John M. Fleming/
John M. Fleming, Registration No. 56,536

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001